

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, and 15 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 2, and 15 can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0013]. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objects to the word "patch" in claims 1, 2, and 15. Applicant has amended "patch" to "path" as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13, 15-18, and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Rigsby et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,556,971) in view of Shostak (U.S. Pat. No. 6,892,083). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The teachings of Rigsby et al. are generally directed toward computer implemented speech recognition system training. In particular, the Examiner relies on Rigsby et al. to teach obtaining a first user utterance, storing it as a model in a user-built lexicon, associating the first utterance with a function, when the user provides a second utterance, attempting to match the second utterance with the first utterance in order to execute the function, returning an error message if the second utterance is not found, and allowing the user to then navigate to the function and provide the first utterance. However, Rigsby et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate a voice binding system that, upon user navigation to a menu location during a voice binding training mode, notifies

the user that no voice binding exists for the location and prompts the user to provide the voice binding. In contrast, Rigsby et al. only sends the error message when no match is found, and the user then has to navigate to the function to provide the voice binding. Also, Rigsby et al. fail to teach, suggest, or motivate that an existing voice binding is reproduced for the user during the voice binding training mode upon user navigation to its menu location, and that the user is then provided with an option to delete or re-enter the voice binding.

The teachings of Shostak are generally directed toward voice controlled wireless communication. In particular, the Examiner relies on Shostak to teach using speech recognition to attempt to dial phone numbers in a buddy list and, in the event of ambiguity, audibly reproducing the names for the user to select one of the names. However, Rigsby et al. and Shostak do not teach, suggest, or motivate a voice binding system that, upon user navigation to a menu location during a voice binding training mode, notifies the user that no voice binding exists for the location and prompts the user to provide the voice binding. Also, Rigsby et al. and Shostak fail to teach, suggest, or motivate that an existing voice binding is reproduced for the user during the voice binding training mode upon user navigation to its menu location, and that the user is then provided with an option to delete or re-enter the voice binding, especially where there can be no ambiguity regarding the path sequences navigated by the user during the voice binding training mode.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward a voice binding system that, upon manual identification of a path sequence by a user during a voice binding training mode, makes a determination whether a first utterance already exists in association with

the patch sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either plays the first utterance for the user if it already exists and gives the user the option to delete or re-enter the first utterance, or, if it does not yet exist, prompts the user to provide the first utterance for association with the path sequence. For example, independent claim 1, especially as amended, recites, "identifying a path sequence by which a first location within a menu would be reached by user navigation to said first location during a voice binding training mode via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of said electronic product ... and upon said identifying, making a determination whether said first utterance already exists in association with said path sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either: (a) playing said first utterance if it already exists and giving the user the option to delete or re-enter the first utterance, or (b) prompting the user to provide said first utterance if it does not yet exist." Independent claims 2 and 15, especially as amended, recite similar subject matter. Support for the amendments can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0013]. Therefore, Beyda et al. and Rigsby et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate all of the limitations of the independent claims. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 10-14 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rigsby et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,556,971) in view of Shostak (U.S. Pat. No. 6,892,083) and De Armas et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,873,064). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For discussion of significant differences between Applicant's claimed invention and the teachings of Rigsby et al. and Shostak, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to remarks detailed above with respect to rejection of independent claims 2 and 15.

The teachings of De Armas et al. are generally directed toward a multi-action voice macro method. In particular, the Examiner relies on De Armas et al. to teach matching a phrase decoded from a user utterance to a vocabulary phrase of a sub-context tree generated by automated analysis of a menu structure. However, Rigsby et al., Shostak, and De Armas et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate a voice binding system that, upon user navigation to a menu location during a voice binding training mode, notifies the user that no voice binding exists for the location and prompts the user to provide the voice binding. Also, Rigsby et al., Shostak, and De Armas et al. fail to teach, suggest, or motivate that an existing voice binding is reproduced for the user during the voice binding training mode upon user navigation to its menu location, and that the user is then provided with an option to delete or re-enter the voice binding.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed toward a voice binding system that, upon manual identification of a path sequence by a user during a voice binding training mode, makes a determination whether a first utterance already exists in association with the path sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either plays the first utterance for the user if it already exists and gives the user the option to delete or re-enter the first utterance, or, if it does not yet exist, prompts the user to provide the first utterance for association with the path sequence. For example, independent claim 2, especially as amended, recites, "identifying a user-selected navigation path sequence

through said menu structure to a first location within said menu in response to user navigation to said first location during a voice binding training mode via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of said electronic product ... and upon said identifying, making a determination whether said first utterance already exists in association with said path sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, either: (a) playing said first utterance if it already exists and giving the user the option to delete or re-enter the first utterance, or (b) prompting the user to provide said first utterance if it does not yet exist." Independent claim 15, especially as amended, recites similar subject matter. Support for the amendments can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0013]. Therefore, Rigsby et al., Shostak, and De Armas et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate all of the limitations of the independent claims. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 10-14 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of their dependence from allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted.

Dated: February 15, 2007

E-Signature: /Gregory A. Stobbs/
By: Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600